

## REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 4, 2005 ("Office Action") and a conversation with Examiner Farahani on March 29, 2005. The Examiner has indicated that claims 1-22 are allowable (Office Action Summary and statement of reasons for allowance) because of a limitation of a "conductive region underlying and surrounding the conductive pad." Applicants' attorney, as discussed with the Examiner, believes the Examiner's rejection regarding claims 12-22 in the detailed action are therefore erroneous since independent claim 12 includes the indicated allowable limitation of a "conductive region is underlying and surrounding the conductive bonding layer." Clarification is respectfully requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement ("IDS") was filed by applicant on May 29, 2003. The Examiner is respectfully requested to review the cited art and return an initialed copy of the IDS.

Claims 1-22 are allowed. Claims 23-37 are cancelled.

Claims 38-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,329,694 ("Lee").

Claims 23, 24, 26, 27 and 29-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view of Japanese Patent No. 60000769 ("*Sakai et al.*").

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee* as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of "Microelectronic Circuits" ("*Sedra et al.*").

### I. Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

In the Office Action, the Examiner provided Reasons for Allowance (hereinafter referred to as the "REASONS"). Applicants believe that the REASONS, to the extent understood, may be misconstrued and, as such, are incomplete. Applicants submit that indeed, the claims of the instant application, individually or in combination with other claims (via dependency), describe the patentable subject matter of Applicants' invention(s). Accordingly, the REASONS in no way bind or affect the interpretation, infringement, validity and/or enforceability of any claim(s) or patent(s) resulting from, or relating to this application.

### II. Rejection of Claims 38-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 38-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee*.

As discussed in a telephone conference on March 29, 2005, claim 38 includes the limitation "a first doped region of a first conductivity type disposed in a semiconductor substrate of a second conductivity type, wherein the first doped region is underlying and surrounding the conductive pad" and therefore is patentable for similar reasons stated above in regard to claims 1 and 12.

Claims 39-45 depend from independent claim 38 and therefore is patentable for at least the same reasons stated above in regard to claim 38.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 38-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

III. Conclusion

Based on the above, it is respectfully requested that Claims 1-22 and 38-45 be passed to issuance.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 30, 2005

By:



Kirk J. DeNiro  
Reg. No. 35,854

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP  
685 Market Street, Suite 540  
San Francisco, California 94105-4206  
Telephone: (415) 369-9660 x204  
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665